**DOCUMENT RESUME**

**ED 160 110** **IR 006 486**

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Weintraub, D. Kathryn |
| TITLE | Review of "Domanovszky's Functions and Objects of Author and Title Cataloging." |
| PUB DATE | Feb 77 |
| NOTE | 8p.; Lecture notes for Graduate Library School, University of Chicago |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Cataloging; Divided Catalogs; Library Science; *Theories |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Domanovszky (A) |

ABSTRACT

These notes prepared for an advanced course on the theory and history of cataloging contain a summary of and comments on three aspects of Domanovszky's cataloging theory: (1) the function of the catalog is to identify all publications of a work, as well as all editions of a publication; (2) a catalog code should specify alternative practices for the use of entry words and headings for different classes of elementary objects; and (3) corporate entries should not be used. The author disagrees strongly with Domanovszky's contention that corporate entries should not be used at all. (JPF)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED160110

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# REVIEW OF "DOMANOVSZKY'S FUNCTION AND OBJECTS OF AUTHOR AND TITLE CATALOGING"

BY

Kathryn D. Weintraub

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kathryn D. Weintraub

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

IR006486

This review was written while preparing a set of course lecture notes and is distributed now because I thought it might interest a somewhat larger audience. It is not intended for publication.

D. Kathryn Weintraub
February, 1977

Domanovsky, A. Functions and objects of author and title cataloging: a contribution to modern cataloguing theory / by A. Domanovsky. — Budapest : Akademiai Kiado, 1974.

This contribution to cataloging theory pertains to that part of descriptive cataloging which governs the choice of entry words and headings in an alphabetical author-title catalog. In a sense, the argument reviews traditional theory, for the author does not address himself to any of the descriptive problems that have been raised in recent decades by the publication of non-print works. However, most catalogers will want to read it anyway, because his conclusions do not agree in all respects with current cataloging practices (or at least with current American cataloging practices). Library school students will find it a challenging introduction to the philosophy of cataloging, but they may need to read some traditional works as well in order to appreciate the innovative aspects of Mr. Domanovsky's theory.

Briefly, the function of an author-title catalog is to give the user information about 'books,' 'works,' and the 'authors' oeuvres'. Information about these three objects (i.e. 'books', 'works', and 'authors' oeuvres') is to be presented under titles, names of authors and names of other persons who contribute to the production of the book or work. These titles and names are to be listed both in their title

page form and (where different) under an established form. Which of these forms is to be used for main entries, added entries and cross references is not specified; the decision is to be made by the person responsible for each alphabetical list. Presumably, these persons could be the authors of catalog codes and/or the librarians who prepare the individual catalogs.

The word 'objects' in the title of this work requires special attention. It is not a mistranslation for 'objectives.' Objects are the entities identified by the headings in the alphabetical catalog. These objects are differentiated into 'elemental objects' and 'composite objects'; and elemental objects are further differentiated into 'primary', 'secondary', and 'tertiary' elemental objects. Primary elemental objects include both books and series. [n.b. There is some confusion in the text between the words 'series' and 'serial' but what is meant, apparently, is a work published in a book that shares a collective title with other works published in other volumes.] Secondary elemental objects consist of all separate, self-contained items that are included in a book—e.g. an introduction or a short story. Tertiary elemental objects can best be described as aspects of a specific book—e.g. the editing of a book, or the translation. It is not clear to me where illustrations would fit in this system.

Composite objects consist of a set of one or more elemental objects. There are two types of composite objects. The first is the 'work.' This composite object consists of the set of all editions, translations, adaptations, etc. of the work. The second type of composite object is an author's oeuvre. This composite object consists of all the editions, translations, adaptations, etc. of an author's

writings (including those writings which form part of a larger work) and all other books to which he has contributed such assistance as editing, translating, etc.

This terminology is sometimes new, but the ideas appear familiar. However, there are at least three aspects of Mr. Domanovsky's theory which are innovative and merit further consideration. These ideas are:

1. The function of the catalog is to identify all publications of a work (as well as all editions of a publication).

2. A catalog code should specify alternative practices for the use of entry words and headings for different classes of elementary objects.

3. Corporate entries should not be used.

Mr. Domanovsky is not the first person to say that a catalog should identify all publications of a work, but it is only within the last decade that catalogers have begun to formulate the full implications of this objective. In 1876, Cutter stated that one function of the catalog was to assist the user in the selection of an edition. The Paris Principles of 1961 stated the third function of a catalog, thus:

> "The catalog should be an efficient instrument for ascertaining... which editions of a particular work are in the library." (ICCP 2.2b)

and in 1971, Eva Verona suggested that this Principle should be renumbered so as to appear second in a list of three functions.

Presumably, the national libraries in each country are expected to prepare a full set of entries for all elemental objects and for the resultant composite objects. This will result in fuller cataloging (most especially fuller analytical cataloging) than is common today in any library. Other libraries could abbreviate their catalogs in a standard way, if the national code would specify which subclasses of objects were to be accessible in catalogs for research libraries, small

public libraries, etc. There are obvious advantages to the idea of defining the contents of large numbers of manually accessible and overlapping files in such a systematic manner. It would be easier to predict what appears in each catalog; it would be easier to explain problems concerning the choice of a set of headings to introductory cataloging students; ... etc. Moreover, if such files were produced from a single computer data file such a systematic set of policies would be easier for programmers to implement.

However, there are two questions that need to be asked. The first is:

> Can libraries afford to increase the number of entry words and headings that are used in a full catalog even if this catalog is the catalog of the national library?

The second question is:

> What purpose will an abbreviated manual file serve in a library that can access the full file of the national library directly?

I think this suggestion is about 50-75 years too late. Librarians should, rather, direct their attention to the formulation of standards for a code that will fit in well with the practice of the next one-hundred years.

The reasons for using or not using corporate entries in an author-title catalog have already been discussed many times—and the discussion will undoubtedly continue for at least another decade. Mr. Domanovsky[3] gives some reasons for not using them at all (or, if there must be a compromise, of using them only for added entries). First, there is no commonly accepted and unambiguous definition of a corporate author. Second, he finds no easy way to distinguish between a corporate body functioning as an author and a corporate body that is merely responsible for the publication of a work:

> "A publishing firm which publishes the work of a well-known novelist is not considered by anybody a corporate author, since it did not contribute anything to the intellectual substance of the novel. At the other end of the scale (e.g. in the case of an annual report of a body) one is confronted with a diametrically opposed situation : the persons who participated in the composition of the report remain in the background and very often also anonymous : the report is the product of co-operation between several persons acting not on their account, but on behalf of different organs of the body. In such a case it seems not unwarranted to speak about an authorship of the body; and it is also in this sort of case of corporate authorship par excellence that one has to look for the reasons for the world-wide adoption of that concept and term. But that novel and that report are not typical for all corporate publications. They are the opposite poles ... of a wide field of extremely multifarious forms generated in abundance by the different agents having a part in the production of books. ... There is nowhere a clear dividing line discernible which might cut the whole range of corporate publications not only plausibly but also clearly into two opposite groups — into those which may be considerably as having the body for their author, and those which may not. ..." (pp. 123-124).

These arguments are not conclusive, however. A personal author, for Domanovšky[3] is ...

> "a person who has written the original version of a work..." (p. 116)

Clearly, a corporate body can never actually write a text, but Domanovšky[3] allows entries under other persons who are not, within his definition, personal authors. Such persons include editors, translators, compilers, etc. Compilers, for example, cannot be said to have written the text of the publication.

Furthermore, the question of authorship is only one of the classic reasons for using corporate authors.

> "'The American way is preferable for two reasons: first, because as a matter of fact these bodies are the authors not only of their proceedings but also of their collections regarded as a whole; secondly, because as a matter of convenience, both in the enlargement of the library and in the service of the public, it is better that all books connected with the name of a society or government should be brought together in one place. It is true that in a dictionary

> catalog this may be accomplished more-or-less inappropriately by entry under the name of the society as a subject; but in an author catalog it does not come about at all..." (Cutter, C.A. Rules for a dictionary catalog ... 4th ed., 1904, p. 40).

The first argument may be unfortunate within the present context but the second is more disturbing. What good will it do to say that, since we cannot define corporate authors, we will exclude them from our catalog if we must then provide other means for answering such reference queries? We will still have to answer the same questions about the choice and form of corporate names and then file these records in a separate file because it has been decided that such information should not be included in an alphabetical catalog. Accordingly, I think we should not be looking for ways to reduce the scope of a catalog code. Instead we ought to look more closely at reference strategy in order to integrate the data files that are searched for information regardless of whether these files are lists of holdings, reference books, or separate information files which have been constructed by a busy reference librarian in order to save time when patrons keep asking the same thing over and over. Thus, I think this study provides a good logical analysis of one element of that information file which a librarian needs, but it does not integrate this element into the overall organization of information files and it does not take into account the changes which are likely to occur in the organization of information files because of the technology which is being developed within libraries today.